U.S. Serial No. 10/697,219 Response to the Office Action of October 8, 2004

## **Changes to the Drawings**

A proposed substitute drawing of FIG. 2 is submitted herewith including the label "CONTROLLER" for reference numeral 18. It is respectfully submitted that the addition of the foregoing label is fully supported by the original specification including by at least page 3. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

#### **REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 7, and claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 16. Claims 7 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-22 remain pending and at issue, with claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 being independent. Claims 9-14 and 19-22 stand allowed. Claims 7 and 16 are objected to, but would be allowed if redrafted in independent form. Additionally, claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 are objected to for clarity reasons. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

### **Drawings**

The applicant submits a replacement sheet including FIG. 2 labeling box 18 as the "CONTROLLER." The foregoing should eliminate any objection to the drawings.

### **Specification**

The specification has been objected for failing to provide antecedent basis for claims 1, 9, 15, and 19. The applicant notes that these claims have been amended to clarify the claim language to better correspond to the detailed description. In particular, the claims are fully supported in at least the illustration and description of FIGS. 3 and 4. Furthermore, it is well established that while the particular words in the claims may not appear as such in the specification, the meaning thereof by other words may constitute adequate antecedent basis for the words in fact used. *Ex parte Siegmund and Cole*, 156 U.S.P.Q. 477 (PTO Bd. App. 1967). Thus, the foregoing amendments in combination with the detailed disclosure in the specification should eliminate any objections that may have been proper.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 have been objected to for lack of clarity. Claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 have been amended to clarify that the densitometric meter measures an ink density, and that the measurement is used to determine the ink density at which the test screening pattern reaches a plugging point (e.g., a solid screening). The determined ink density is then used to create a density adjustment, for example a density curve, such that any ink density above the plugging point is sufficiently reduced to cause the printing press to print a screening pattern without reaching the plugging point. Therefore, the foregoing amendment should eliminate any objection to the claims the may have been proper.

# The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 8, 15, 17 and 18 were rejected as anticipated by Brunner (US 4,854,485) as well as by Pfeiffer (U.S. 5,122,977). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 7 and 16, respectively, which have been indicated as being allowable over the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1 and 15 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9-14 and claim 19-22 have been amended to clarify the claim language in connection with the objections noted by the Office action. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9-14 and 19-22 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

U.S. Serial No. 10/697,219 Response to the Office Action of October 8, 2004

#### Conclusion

Various claims have been amended to eliminate "step for" language to make it clear that such claims are not to be construed under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶6. It is respectfully submitted that such amendments are not narrowing and are not made for reasons related to patentability.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC 20 North Wacker Drive **Suite 4220** 

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dated: March 8, 2005

Keith R. Jarosik

Reg. No. 47,683

Attorney for Applicants

(312) 580-1133